Deciding When to Submit a 510(k) for a Software Change to an Existing Device

---

Draft Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff

DRAFT GUIDANCE

This draft guidance document is being distributed for comment purposes only.

Document issued on August 8, 2016.

You should submit comments and suggestions regarding this draft document within 90 days of publication in the *Federal Register* of the notice announcing the availability of the draft guidance. Submit electronic comments to http://www.regulations.gov. Submit written comments to the Division of Dockets Management (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852. Identify all comments with the docket number listed in the notice of availability that publishes in the *Federal Register*.

For questions about this document, contact (CDRH) Linda Ricci, Office of Device Evaluation, 301-796-6325, Linda.Ricci@fda.hhs.gov.

For questions about this document regarding CBER-regulated devices, contact the Office of Communication, Outreach and Development (OCOD), by calling 1-800-835-4709 or 240-402-8010.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Devices and Radiological Health
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research

Preface

Additional Copies

CDRH

Additional copies are available from the Internet. You may also send an e-mail request to CDRH-Guidance@fda.hhs.gov to receive a copy of the guidance. Please use the document number 1500055 to identify the guidance you are requesting.

CBER

Additional copies are available from the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER), by written request, Office of Communication, Outreach, and Development (OCOD), 10903 New Hampshire Ave., Bldg. 71, Room 3128, Silver Spring, MD 20993-0002, or by calling 1-800-835-4709 or 240-402-8010, by email, ocod@fda.hhs.gov or from the Internet at http://www.fda.gov/BiologicsBloodVaccines/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/default.htm.

Table of Contents

Deciding When to Submit a 510(k) for a Software Change to an Existing Device

---

Draft Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff

This draft guidance, when finalized, will represent the current thinking of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA or Agency) on this topic. It does not establish any rights for any person and is not binding on FDA or the public. You can use an alternative approach if it satisfies the requirements of the applicable statutes and regulations. To discuss an alternative approach, contact the FDA staff responsible for this guidance as listed on the title page.

I. Introduction

This guidance, when finalized, will assist industry and Agency staff in determining when a software (including firmware) change to a 510(k)-cleared or a preamendments device subject to 510(k) (also referred to in this document as "an existing device") may require a manufacturer to submit and obtain FDA clearance of a new premarket notification (510(k)).

For the current edition of the FDA-recognized standards referenced in this document, see the FDA Recognized Consensus Standards Database at http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfStandards/search.cfm.

FDA's guidance documents, including this draft guidance, do not establish legally enforceable responsibilities. Instead, guidances describe the Agency's current thinking on a topic and should be viewed only as recommendations, unless specific regulatory or statutory requirements are cited. The use of the word *should* in Agency guidance means that something is suggested or recommended, but not required.

II. Background

The regulatory criteria in 21 CFR 807.81(a)(3) state that a premarket notification must be submitted when:

> *(3) The device is one that the person currently has in commercial distribution or is reintroducing into commercial distribution, but that is about to be significantly changed or modified in design, components, method of manufacture, or intended use. The following constitute significant changes or modifications that require a premarket notification:*
>
> > *(i) A change or modification in the device that could significantly affect the safety or effectiveness of the device, e.g., a significant change or modification in design, material, chemical composition, energy source, or manufacturing process.*
> >
> > *(ii) A major change or modification in the intended use of the device.*

FDA issued the original *Deciding When to Submit a 510(k) for a Change to an Existing Device (K97-1)* on January 10, 1997 to provide guidance on this regulatory language. As stated in that guidance, the key issue regarding 21 CFR 807.81(a)(3) is that the phrase "could significantly affect the safety or effectiveness of the device" and the use of the adjectives "major" and "significant" sometimes lead FDA and device manufacturers to different interpretations. That guidance provided the Agency's interpretation of these terms, with principles and points for manufacturers to consider in analyzing how changes in devices may affect safety or effectiveness and determining whether a new 510(k) must be submitted for a particular type of change. This draft guidance preserves the basic format and content of the original, with updates to add clarity. The added clarity is intended to increase consistent interpretations of the guidance by FDA staff and manufacturers.

The 510(k) Process and the Quality System Regulation

Any guidance on 510(k)s for changes to a legally marketed device should consider the role the Quality System (QS) regulation, 21 CFR Part 820, plays in changes to devices. For some types of changes to a device, the Agency believes that a new 510(k) is not necessary and that reliance on existing QS requirements may reasonably assure the safety and effectiveness of the changed device.

Among other requirements, the QS regulation requires manufacturers of finished medical devices to review and approve changes to device design and production (21 CFR 820.30 and 820.70) and document changes and approvals in the device master record (21 CFR 820.181). Any process whose results cannot be fully verified by subsequent inspection and testing must be validated (21 CFR 820.75), and changes to the process require review, evaluation, and revalidation of the process where appropriate (21 CFR 820.75(c)).

The net effect of the QS regulation is to require that, when manufacturers of a finished medical device make a change in the design of a device, there is a process in place to demonstrate that the manufactured device meets the change in design specifications (or the original specifications, if no change was intended). They must keep records, and these records must be made available to an FDA investigator (see Section 704(e) of the FD&C Act). For many types of changes to a

device, a new 510(k) may not be required per 21 CFR 807.81(a)(3). In these cases, compliance with the QS regulation can reasonably assure the safety and effectiveness of the changed device.

III. Scope

As used in this draft guidance, "software" is the set of electronic instructions used to control the actions or output of a medical device, to provide input to or output from a medical device, or to provide the actions of a medical device. This definition includes software that is embedded within or permanently a component of a medical device, software that is an accessory to another medical device, or software that is intended to be used for one or more medical purposes that performs these purposes without being part of a hardware medical device.[1]

This guidance, when finalized, will aid manufacturers of medical devices subject to premarket notification requirements who intend to modify a 510(k)-cleared device or a preamendments device subject to 510(k) (also referred to together as "existing devices") during the process of deciding whether the modification exceeds the regulatory threshold of 21 CFR 807.81(a)(3) for submission and clearance of a new 510(k). Note that any person required to register under 21 CFR 807.20 who plans to introduce a device into commercial distribution for the first time must, per 21 CFR 807.81(a)(2), submit a 510(k) if that device is not exempt from premarket notification requirements. Private label distributors and repackagers are exempt from submitting a 510(k) if they satisfy the requirements of 21 CFR 807.85(b). This guidance, when finalized, is not intended to address modifications to devices that are 510(k)-exempt or require premarket approval (PMA).

This draft guidance specifically addresses software modifications. Any modifications that are not modifications to software are not within the scope of this draft guidance; such changes (e.g., labeling changes) should be evaluated using *Deciding When to Submit a 510(k) for a Change to an Existing Device (K97-1)*. This draft guidance does not apply to software for which the Agency has stated in guidance that it does not intend to enforce compliance with applicable regulatory controls (see, e.g., *Mobile Medical Applications Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff*). Further, this draft guidance does not address the software lifecycle (covered in AAMI/ANSI/IEC 62304: *Medical device software - software life cycle processes*), what documentation should be included in a 510(k) for a software modification (covered in *Guidance for the Content of Premarket Submissions for Software Contained in Medical Devices*) or the principles that are applicable to the validation of medical device software (covered in *General Principles of Software Validation; Final Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff*).

This guidance, when finalized, is also intended to apply to situations when a legally-marketed existing device is the subject of a recall and a change in the device or its labeling is indicated. For more information on recommended procedures in a recall situation, please see Blue Book

[1] IMDRF/SaMD WG/N10: *Software as a Medical Device (SaMD): Key Definitions*.

Memorandum K95-1, *510(k) Requirements During Firm-Initiated Recalls.* As stated in that guidance, if a correction alters a device rather than simply restoring it to its original specifications, a new 510(k) may be required. This guidance, when finalized, may be useful in determining whether a new 510(k) is warranted in cases where the correction does alter the device.

This draft guidance does not specifically address combination products, such as drug/device or biologic/device combinations; however, the general principles and concepts described herein may be helpful to manufacturers in determining whether a 510(k) is necessary for changes to software-containing device constituent parts of combination products.

Software modifications can take numerous forms, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Adaptive – modification of software to keep it usable in a changed or changing environment;
- Corrective – reactive modification of software to address discovered faults; or
- Perfective – modification of software to improve performance or maintainability.

In addition, software modifications may be identified by many other names, including, but not limited to: bug fix, hot patch, software change or tweak. Regardless of name or form, these are considered design changes under the Quality System regulation, 21 CFR Part 820.

This draft guidance, when finalized, is not intended to supersede device-specific guidance (such as the *Infusion Pumps Total Product Life Cycle*), but may cover areas not addressed in any device-specific guidance.

Since the scope of this draft guidance is limited to changes to software only, it may be necessary to refer to other relevant FDA guidance documents that aid in the evaluation of non-software device modifications, such as *Deciding When to Submit a 510(k) for a Change to an Existing Device (K97-1)*. It is the manufacturer's responsibility to collectively evaluate the combination of both software and non-software changes to evaluate the impact of a change to a device. For those circumstances where the proposed change is not addressed in this draft guidance, in *Deciding When to Submit a 510(k) for a Change to an Existing Device (K97-1)*,, or in a device-specific guidance, manufacturers are encouraged to contact the appropriate office in CDRH or CBER.

IV. Guiding Principles

In using this guidance for deciding whether to submit a new 510(k) for a modification to an existing- device, a number of guiding principles should be followed. Some derive from existing FDA 510(k) policy and are widely known, and others are necessary for using the logic scheme contained in this guidance. Thus, anyone using this guidance should bear in mind the following guiding principles:

- **Modifications made with intent to significantly affect safety or effectiveness of a device –** If a manufacturer modifies their device with the intent to significantly improve the safety or effectiveness of the device (for example, in response to a known risk, adverse events, etc.), a new 510(k) is likely required. Changes that are not intended to significantly affect the safety or effectiveness of a device, however, should still be evaluated to determine whether the change could significantly affect device safety or effectiveness.

    - If a manufacturer modifies their device to address a violation or recall, they should refer to FDA guidances Blue Book Memorandum K95-1, *510(k) Requirements During Firm-Initiated Recalls* and *Distinguishing Medical Device Recalls from Medical Device Enhancements*.

- **"Could significantly affect" evaluation and the role of testing –** To determine whether a change or modification could significantly affect the safety or effectiveness of a device, the manufacturer should first conduct a risk-based assessment, using the guidance below, of whether the change could significantly affect the device's safety or effectiveness, either positively or negatively. This risk-based assessment should identify and analyze all new risks and changes in known risks resulting from the device modification, and lead to an initial decision whether or not a new 510(k) is required. If the initial decision following the risk assessment is that a new 510(k) is not required, this decision should be confirmed by successful, routine verification and validation activities. If routine verification and validation activities produce any unexpected issues, any prior decision that a new 510(k) is not required should be reconsidered. Verification and validation requirements apply for all devices subject to 21 CFR 820.30.

- **Unintended consequences of changes** – Software modifications may trigger additional unintended or unplanned consequences. In evaluating whether a change requires a new 510(k), manufacturers should consider whether there are any unintended consequences or effects of the device change. For example, an intended operating system (OS) upgrade may trigger unintended effects in device drivers and software code embedded in the device. Manufacturers should consider all consequences of changes to determine whether a new 510(k) is required.

- **Use of risk management –** The risk profile referred to throughout this document is based on the combination of multiple risk concepts which are important for managing the risks of medical devices. Hazards and hazardous situations, risk estimation, risk acceptability, risk control, risk/benefit analysis and overall risk evaluation are all concepts that can be applied during the design and development of a medical device. The concept of risk, as defined in ISO 14971: *Medical devices – Application of risk management to medical devices*, is the combination of the probability of occurrence of harm and the severity of that harm. Although the risk terminology used in this document is primarily derived from ISO 14971, it is recognized that an individual manufacturer's terminology may differ. Because 21 CFR 807.81(a)(3)(i) requires a new 510(k) when a change "could

significantly affect safety or effectiveness," both safety and effectiveness should be considered in evaluating a device's risk profile. The risk terminology from AAMI TIR 32 "Medical Device Software Risk Management" is also used in this guidance.

- **Evaluating simultaneous changes –** Because many simultaneous changes may be considered at once, each change should be assessed separately, as well as in aggregate.

- **Appropriate comparative device and cumulative effect of changes –** In using this guidance to help determine whether a particular change requires the submission of a new 510(k), manufacturers should make a risk-based assessment that compares the changed device to their device as previously found to be substantially equivalent in their most recently cleared 510(k) (or to their preamendments device, if no 510(k) has been cleared). Manufacturers may make a number of changes without having to submit a new 510(k), but each time they make a change, the device they should compare it to is their most recently cleared device. When the manufacturer compares the proposed modified device to the device in its most recently cleared 510(k), the manufacturer should evaluate the cumulative impact of all changes since their most recently cleared 510(k).

- **Documentation requirement –** Whenever manufacturers change their device, they must take certain actions to comply with the QS regulation, 21 CFR Part 820, unless the device in question is exempt by regulation from the QS regulation. The QS regulation requires, among other things, that device changes be documented.

- **510(k) submissions for modified devices –** When a new 510(k) is submitted for a device with multiple modifications, that 510(k) should describe all changes that trigger the requirement for a new 510(k). That 510(k) should also describe other modifications since the last cleared 510(k) (i.e., those that did not require a new 510(k)) that would have been documented as part of the original 510(k) for that device. This helps ensure that FDA has a more complete understanding of the device under review. For instance, an original 510(k) would not typically identify or describe individual components of a circuit board, such as resistors, and therefore FDA would not expect modifications to the resistors to be listed in the new 510(k) for a modified device if they did not trigger the requirement for a 510(k). However, 510(k)s typically include a listing of device warnings in the labeling, so if a warning in the device's labeling has been modified, that change should be described in the new 510(k) even if that change did not itself trigger the requirement for a new 510(k).

    - If a manufacturer makes multiple changes to a device, but only one change triggers the requirement for a new 510(k), the changes that do not require a new 510(k) may be immediately implemented, so long as those changes can be implemented independently of changes that do require a new 510(k). Those changes should, however, be described in the new 510(k) for the change that does require submission (subject to the preceding bullet).

- **Substantial equivalence determinations –** Manufacturers should understand that, even though they may follow this guidance and submit a new 510(k), a substantially equivalent determination is not assured. See *The 510(k) Program: Evaluating Substantial Equivalence in Premarket Notifications (510(k))* for more information on the decision-making process FDA uses to determine substantial equivalence.

V. How to Use This Guidance

This guidance uses a flowchart and text with considerations and examples to help manufacturers through the logic scheme necessary to decide whether to submit a new 510(k) for a software change to an existing device.

A single logic scheme covering all the intricacies in software modifications and their impact on the decision to submit a new 510(k) would be impractical to develop. Rather, for ease of use, a flowchart and text expected to cover the most common software modifications has been created.

Manufacturers should use the flowchart in concert with the guiding principles above, the text below, and additional factors in section VI. Answer the questions posed for each individual type of change (e.g., performance specification change, OS driver change) until a decision is made either to submit a new 510(k) or to document the basis for concluding that a new 510(k) is not required. As mentioned above, when making the decision on whether to submit a new 510(k) for changes, the manufacturer's basis for comparison of any changed device should be the device described in the manufacturer's most recently cleared 510(k) for this device, or to their legally-marketed preamendments device. Manufacturers are required to submit a new 510(k) when a change (or changes) exceeds the §807.81(a)(3) threshold, "could significantly affect the safety or effectiveness of the device," or constitutes a "major change or modification in the intended use of the device." This significant effect could be positive or negative. One must keep in mind that what may on the surface appear to be one discrete change to a device may involve multiple changes of various types.

In cases with multiple changes, manufacturers should use all applicable parts of the flowchart and explanatory text. As explained in the Guiding Principles, a new 510(k) is required for any change that triggers the need for a new 510(k).

Note that the flowchart entries, "new 510(k)" and "documentation," are written in this way only for conciseness. The reader should interpret "new 510(k)" as **a new 510(k) is likely required** and "document" as **a new 510(k) is likely not required, document your analysis, and file it for future reference.** The goal of the flowchart is to provide guidance in answering a manufacturer's questions on whether a new 510(k) should be expected for a software change and to minimize the number of instances where the answer would be uncertain.

359 Figure 1 – When to File a New 510(k) For a Software Change to an Existing Device
360



361

1. Is the change made solely to strengthen cybersecurity and does not have any other impact on the software or device?

In many cases, a change made solely to strengthen cybersecurity is not likely to require a new 510(k). Cybersecurity updates are considered a subset of software changes that are implemented to strengthen the security of a system, protect information, and reduce disruption in service. FDA expects manufacturers to ensure that such changes do not impact the performance of the device by performing necessary analysis, verification and/or validation. If a manufacturer becomes aware of any incidental or unintended impacts of the change on other aspects of the software or device, the manufacturer should continue through the remaining questions in this guidance. The manufacturer should also refer to FDA's *Content of Premarket Submissions for Management of Cybersecurity in Medical Devices*.

2. Is the change made solely to return the system into specification of the most recently cleared device?

When a change to the software only restores the device to the specifications of the most recently cleared device, then a new 510(k) is likely not required. Generally, it is unlikely that modifications to software solely to restore the device to the most recently cleared device's specifications could significantly impact safety, effectiveness, or intended use of the device; however, manufacturers should evaluate the impact of the software changes. Manufacturers should conduct an analysis that involves determining the overall impact of the change to the device in terms of risk assessment and performance. The concepts expressed in Questions 3 through 6 below could be helpful in this analysis. In addition, this analysis is important for evaluating any modification that adds new features in order to restore the device to its original specifications.

Missing, incomplete, ambiguous, or conflicting software requirements may lead to a software modification that involves updating specifications, resulting in additional software code changes. In these situations, the answer to this question is likely no and the manufacturer should proceed to Question 3.

Generally, manufacturers are not required to submit a new 510(k) for changes to a specification document for the purpose of clarifying an existing software requirement or to capture a missing software requirement, provided that this does not necessitate any changes to software code or product performance specifications. However, manufacturers should still assess the impact of the changes on other software documentation when applying appropriate design controls.

3. Does the change introduce a new cause or modify an existing cause of a hazardous situation that could result in significant

harm and that is not effectively mitigated in the most recently cleared device?

A "hazardous situation" exists when a there is a potential source of harm; that is, there is potential exposure to physical injury or damage to the health of people. The term "cause" refers to the cause of a hazardous situation, as identified and defined by the manufacturer in the risk management file for the device. Significant harm refers to situations where the risk level is serious or more severe, e.g., the risk could result in injury or impairment requiring professional medical intervention, permanent impairment, or death.

The purpose of this question is to determine whether a new ***cause*** of a hazardous situation is created, or an existing cause altered, as a result of the software change. If the following criteria are all met, then a new 510(k) is likely required:

1. The change leads the manufacturer to document a new cause or the modification of an existing cause in the risk management file.
    - Note: This criterion is met if the change creates a new cause or modifies an existing cause (such as increasing the likelihood) of an existing hazardous situation.
2. The level of harm associated with the new or modified cause is considered serious or more severe, e.g., the cause of the hazardous situation could result in injury or impairment requiring professional medical intervention, permanent impairment or death. For the purposes of this criterion, the pre-mitigation risk score should be assessed in order to focus on the effects of the change.
3. The hazardous situation associated with the new or modified cause is not already effectively mitigated in the most recently cleared device.
    - Note: This criterion is met if there are no existing risk control measures in the most recently cleared device that reduce the risk associated with this cause to an acceptable level.

If all of the criteria are not met, proceed to Question 4.

4. Does the change introduce a new hazardous situation or modify an existing hazardous situation that could result in significant harm and that is not effectively mitigated in the most recently cleared device?

The purpose of this question is to determine whether a new ***hazardous situation*** is created, or an existing hazardous situation altered, as a result of the software change. If the following criteria are all met, then a new 510(k) is likely required:

1. The change leads the manufacturer to document a new hazardous situation or the modification of an existing hazardous situation in the risk management file.
    - Note: This criterion is met if the change creates a new hazardous situation or modifies an existing hazardous situation (such as increasing the likelihood of such).
2. The level of harm associated with the new or modified hazardous situation is considered serious or more severe, e.g., the hazardous situation could result in injury or impairment requiring professional medical intervention, permanent impairment or death. For the purposes of this criterion, the pre-mitigation risk score should be assessed in order to focus on the effects of the change.
3. The hazardous situation is not effectively mitigated in the most recently cleared device.
    - Note: This criterion is met if there are no existing risk control measures in the most recently cleared device that reduce the risk associated with this hazardous situation to an acceptable level.

If all of the criteria are not met, proceed to Question 5.

5. Does the change create or necessitate a new risk control measure or a modification of an existing risk control measure for a hazardous situation that could result in significant harm?

It is possible that introducing new risk control measures or implementing changes to risk control measures could significantly affect the safety or effectiveness of the product, and thus such changes should be evaluated. It may be that the change is directly tied to the risk control measures or the software change may necessitate a new or modified risk control measure. Changes to risk control measures may be necessary due to new, modified, or previously unknown hazardous situations or causes thereof. If the changes to risk controls are necessary to effectively prevent significant harm, a new 510(k) is likely required. Note that a new 510(k) is likely not required as a result of a manufacturer implementing additional risk control measures, provided this is not in response to a new, modified, or previously known hazardous situation or causes thereof. For example, a new 510(k) is likely not required when implementing redundant risk control measures or enhancing existing risk control measures if the risk control measures in the most recently cleared device effectively mitigated the hazardous situation.

If the answer to this question is no, proceed to Question 6.

6. Could the change significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device?

Changes in performance specifications encompass everything from routine specification changes necessary to improve device performance to significant product redesigns. For the purpose of this question, specifications include elements that could influence the device's ability to clinically perform as intended. These specifications may address attributes such as speed, strength, response times, throughput, limits of operation, reliability, delivery rate, or assay performance.

If the software change could significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device, then a new 510(k) is likely required. For *in vitro* diagnostic devices (IVDs), this includes a change that could have clinically significant impact in terms of clinical decision-making. This question does not address direct changes to the intended use of the device. If there is a change in the intended use of the device, refer to FDA's guidance, *Deciding When to Submit a 510(k) for a Change to an Existing Device (K97-1)* .

Performance specifications for IVDs establish clinical and analytical performance specifications as part of the design input for the device. Assay performance includes both clinical and analytical performance. Clinical performance is the documented ability of an IVD test or test system to identify, measure, monitor, or predict the presence or absence of, or the future development of, a clinical condition or predisposition, for which the device is intended. Analytical performance refers to the documented ability of an IVD test or test system to measure or detect a target analyte or substance that the IVD test or test system is represented or purported to identify or measure. Depending on the assay, analytical performance specifications may include, for example:

- Analytical Sensitivity: limit of detection, reactivity (inclusivity)
- Analytical Specificity: exclusivity, cross-reactivity, interference
- Cut-off and equivocal zone
- Precision: site-to-site reproducibility, within-laboratory precision/repeatability

There are also times when IVD functionality could be changed but the change is not related to the IVD's intended use and the performance of the modified device could not significantly change from previously cleared performance claims. For these types of software changes, a new 510(k) is likely not required.

VI. Additional Factors to Consider When Determining When to Submit a New 510(k) for a Software Change to an Existing Device

In addition to the questions above, the common issues below should also be considered when determining if a new 510(k) is required.

Medical device software is used in a wide variety of applications and is subject to a wide variety of changes. This draft guidance, therefore, cannot address every type of software change. Nonetheless, the questions in the flowchart and the associated recommendations in the text provide a guide for manufacturers' decision-making and associated documentation. The goal of the draft guidance is to provide examples of software changes that clearly could have a significant impact on the safety or effectiveness of the device based on functional changes to the device's operation (Note: modifications in the intended use of the device are covered in *Deciding When to Submit a 510(k) for a Change to an Existing Device (K97-1)*). The impact of software changes on safety and effectiveness may not always be clear. This is often the case when making general code changes to software that are not necessarily intended to change function, but rather to perform what could be described as "code maintenance" or "infrastructure" modifications. These types of changes can, if not controlled properly, create unexpected changes to how the device functions. As such, these types of changes, as well as others described in this section, should involve a careful evaluation of their potential impact on device safety and effectiveness.

In addition to change management, these types of changes should also involve careful consideration of the overall architecture of the software. If the software architecture was developed in a planned, modular format, the likelihood of unintended impact to other areas of the code may be significantly reduced. On the other hand, if the software code was developed in a looser construct, without a clear architectural plan, the ability to clearly delineate between functional modules in the code may be reduced. The potential impact to device safety and effectiveness increases in code with looser construct, due to the inherent risk of unintended changes in code without clear boundaries in the functional modules.

The purpose of this section is to provide guidance regarding evaluation of certain types of software changes, such as "code maintenance" and "infrastructure" changes. Manufacturers are encouraged to discuss these "gray areas" with the relevant CDRH or CBER Office and Branch if there are questions about whether to submit a new 510(k) for these or other types of software changes. In most cases, this will be the Branch under which the device was originally cleared.

Common Software Change Types

The following list of common change types are intended to help manufacturers consider additional factors that may affect a decision to submit a new 510(k). Note that this list is not

exhaustive and any questions should be discussed with the respective CDRH Offices and/or CBER Offices and/or Branches responsible for the device being modified.

Some of the common software change types include:

- **"Infrastructure"** changes are modifications made to the software support system. Examples include but are not limited to: switching compilers, changing languages (C to C++, C++ to Java), or changing software drivers or libraries.

  The complexity of the change should be taken into consideration while determining whether the change requires a new 510(k). For example, when changing programming languages, the similarity of the programming syntax between the two languages, as well as other factors (such as the coding paradigm associated with the old and new code), should be considered. A change from C to C++ may not entail significant code writing if the syntax is similar. On the other hand, moving from a functional or logical coding paradigm to an Object Oriented Programming paradigm, in conjunction with the change from C to C++, could involve significant software re-write, and a new 510(k) is likely required.

  Similar analysis generally applies to software driver changes, OS changes, etc. It should be noted that significant changes to verification and validation scripts might be a signal that significant infrastructure changes have taken place and should be examined. Updates to scripts alone do not indicate a new 510(k) is required; however, it is important to understand why the scripts are being updated.

- "**Architecture**" changes are modifications to the overall structure of the software. Examples include but are not limited to: porting to a new OS, software changes to support a new hardware platform, and new middleware.

  These changes may impact the overall performance of the device or extend the environment in which the device can operate. The extent of the changes and the impact that they have on the device should be considered in determining whether a new 510(k) is required.

- **"Core algorithm"** changes are modifications made to an algorithm that directly drive the device's intended use. Examples include: alarm algorithms on a monitor, a motor control algorithm for an infusion pump, and a detection module and measurement engine algorithm for an IVD.

  Changes to the core algorithm that impact performance are addressed by the preceding section and flowchart. However, it is important to understand that a complete rewrite of the algorithm, even with the same performance claims and risk profile, may be significant enough to require a new 510(k) because the rewrite may impact performance indirectly.

- **"Clarification of Requirements – No change to Functionality"** are changes made to clarify software requirements after a product has received premarket clearance. This clarification may be revised phrasing of an existing requirement or creation of a new requirement altogether, without changing or adding functionality. Changes made to clarify the requirements as discussed here likely do not require a new 510(k).

- **"Cosmetic Changes – No change to Functionality"** are changes made to the appearance of the device that do not impact the clinical use of the device. For example, changing the company logo that is displayed on the background of every screen could involve modifying multiple software modules; while the number of modules impacted may be large, it is unlikely that the intended change could impact the device's safety and effectiveness or intended use, and a new 510(k) is likely not required.

- **"Reengineering" and "refactoring"** are two common software maintenance techniques. "Reengineering" is defined as the examination and alteration of software to reconstitute it in a new form, and includes the subsequent implementation of the new form. It is often undertaken to replace aging legacy software. "Refactoring" is a disciplined technique for restructuring a software program's internal structure without changing its clinical performance specification. Refactoring seeks to improve a program structure and its maintainability. In general, reengineering often results in broader and more complex changes, while refactoring is often narrower in scope and less complex. The complexity of the change should be considered to determine whether the change requires a new 510(k). Changes that are minor modifications to enhance the maintainability of the device within its specification context are unlikely to require a new 510(k). Changes involving significant software re-write likely require a new 510(k) because of the impact on the performance and on the risk controls.

Appendix A. Software Modification Examples

The following are hypothetical examples of software changes with explanations as to why they likely would or would not require a new 510(k). Note that these generalized examples do not necessarily account for every possible detail, risk, or consideration a manufacturer should evaluate, and should not be taken to mean that the changes described definitely do or do not require a new 510(k). Real-world device modification decisions will depend on the particular details of the change and the specific device in question. Also note that devices with changes requiring a new 510(k) may not be commercially distributed before FDA clears the changed device. See 21 CFR 807.100(a) and sections 513(f)(1) and 513(i) of the Act.

The examples below are only intended to illustrate the principles and recommendations discussed above with regard to a particular question. As such, the examples each contain only the response to the question that is being highlighted; this does not necessarily mean that an earlier question would not have appropriately led to a decision to submit a new 510(k).

Example Number	Flowchart Question	Title
1.1	Q1	**Proactive software security patch**
1.2	Q1	**Adding encryption and additional access control for remote users**
2.1	Q2	**Modify system to meet specification**
2.2	Q2	**Correcting DICOM retrieve parameter error**
2.3	Q2	**Error during maintenance procedure**
2.4	Q2	**Data error**
2.5	Q2	**Database error**
3.1	Q3	**Adding a new diagnostic parameter**
3.2	Q3	**Removing a diagnostic parameter**
4.1	Q4	**Customer maintenance procedure**
4.2	Q4	**Adding new programming mode to a cardiac monitor**
4.3	Q4	**Imaging catheters – new optical module and new laser**
5.1	Q5	**Modification of a risk control**
5.2	Q5	**Modification of threshold settings**

5.3	Q5	**Adding user interface alerts and controls**
5.4	Q5	**Print patient information on PACS report**
5.5	Q5	**Infusion pump alarm**
6.1	Q6	**Improve sample throughput 1**
6.2	Q6	**Improve sample throughput 2**
6.3	Q6	**Analyzer remote monitoring feature improvement**
6.4	Q6	**Software change to modify summary window**
6.5	Q6	**OEM module**
6.6	Q6	**Home monitor**
6.7	Q6	**Device reprocessor user interface change**
6.8	Q6	**Modify device algorithms**
6.9	Q6	**Modification to alarm duration**

1. Flowchart Question 1 Examples

1.1. Proactive software security patch

Description: A device manufacturer finds a security vulnerability as part of an ongoing security evaluation of their device. The manufacturer modifies the software solely to remove this vulnerability. The manufacturer's analysis determined that the change does not have any other impact on the software or the device.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
1	**Is the change made solely to strengthen cybersecurity and does not have any other impact on the software or device?**	Yes	The change is made solely to address cybersecurity vulnerabilities or to strengthen cybersecurity. The manufacturer's analysis determined that the change does not impact any other aspects of the software or device.

Outcome: Document the change to file.

1.2. Adding encryption and additional access control for remote users

Description: A manufacturer makes a software modification to add encryption to the configuration file of the device, and add passcode requirements for remote users, in addition to the password needed to access the device. A timeout is also added for remote users. The manufacturer's analysis determined that the change does not have any other impact on the software or the device.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
1	**Is the change made solely to strengthen cybersecurity and does not have any other impact on the software or device?**	Yes	The change is made to restrict user/customer access to appropriate levels and provide protection to the device configuration information, in order to strengthen the cybersecurity of the device. The manufacturer's analysis determined that the change does not have any other impact on the software or the device.

Outcome: Document the change to file.

2. Flowchart Question 2 Examples

2.1. Modify system to meet specification

Description: A manufacturer makes a software modification to prevent system software from truncating Specimen Identification barcode information. Without the change, the software system would truncate the Specimen ID from the point of an inserted invalid character. For instance, if the invalid character was "%" and the Barcode Specimen ID was "12345%678", the system software would read and assign a Specimen ID of

"12345." This defect could lead to mis-association of patient data. Incorrect software collation of patient information with patient results could lead to incorrect reports. The specification of the most recently cleared device indicated what constituted an invalid character and how invalid characters were to be handled. However, the software did not handle this one particular invalid character in line with the specification. A change is made to the software to prevent the truncation of Specimen Identification barcode information where an invalid character has been inserted.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
2	**Is the change made solely to return the system into specification of the most recently cleared device?**	Yes	The software change disallowed use of the specific invalid character in Specimen IDs as defined in the instrument host interface specification. The original specification indicated how all illegal characters were to be handled. The original device handled all but one as indicated in the specification. The change is made solely to ensure the software meets the original specification.

Outcome: Document the change to file.

2.2. Correcting DICOM retrieve parameter error

Description: A PACS (Picture Archiving and Communication System) is able to automatically retrieve prior studies from a radiology information system to allow comparison with the current study. A software error resulted in a non DICOM-compliant (Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine standard; http://dicom.nema.org/) sending of query parameters that prevented the automatic fetching of prior studies. A manual workaround existed, allowing the user to open these prior studies as needed. The manufacturer implements a software change to bring the product back to specification regarding DICOM conformance (send and retrieve.)

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
2	**Is the change made solely to return the system into specification of the most recently cleared device?**	Yes	The software change is implemented solely to return the system into specification of the most recently cleared device regarding DICOM conformance (send and retrieve) by automatically opening prior studies as expected in a routing reading workflow.

Outcome: Document the change to file.

2.3. Error during maintenance procedure

Description: A manufacturer makes a software modification to fix an automated scheduled daily maintenance procedure. The defect concerned the cleaning solution bottle size parameter used in a maintenance procedure. The defect impacted the system's ability to detect fluid on the bottle septum and caused intermittent fluid detection errors

during the maintenance procedure. The user may need to repeat the procedure 2-3 times to complete the procedure without error. A software change is made to update the size parameter as was originally documented in the software specifications.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
2	**Is the change made solely to return the system into specification of the most recently cleared device?**	Yes	The change is to correct the software error to change the bottle size parameter back to the specified bottle size to bring system back into specification.

Outcome: Document the change to file.

2.4. Data error

Description: An issue was observed in IVD analyzer software that collects reagent administrative records (e.g., material number, lot number, expiration date). The records are to be written by the software into a database table. After enough records are collected to fill the table, newly-collected records are then to be written in the first row of the table, overwriting previous records. Because of a software bug, the system mistakenly merges the new data with the existing data in the first row of the table. The cause of the anomaly was determined to be a coding error that did not affect any of the software requirements. A change was made to correct the software code in the control unit of the analyzer to ensure that data written to a row in the table is not merged with any existing data. The change to the software involved modification of a table within the analyzer software to add new columns to track the administrative data stored for reagents to prevent data from being merged.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
2	**Is the change made solely to return the system into specification of the most recently cleared device?**	Yes	The change was only to address a software anomaly and was not a change in specification or functionality of the most recently cleared device.

Outcome: Document the change to file.

2.5. Database error

Description: An issue was observed for an IVD analyzer in the field. The IVD analyzer software collects reagent administrative records (e.g., material number, lot number, expiration date). The records are to be written by the software into a database table. After enough records are collected to fill the table, newly-collected records are then to be written in the first row of the table, overwriting previous records. Under certain conditions, the software system mistakenly merges the new data with the existing data in

the first row of the table in the database, which may lead to an incorrect result. The cause of the bug was found to be an incorrectly worded software requirement that led to an error in the software code. The requirement was rewritten. An additional software change was made to correct the software code in the control unit of the analyzer. Code was modified to ensure that data written to a database is not merged with any existing data. The change to the software involved creating an entirely separate database within the instrument software, specifically for the administrative records stored for reagents to prevent records from being merged. This change required a specification change at the unit level to describe the new database.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
2	**Is the change made solely to return the system into specification of the most recently cleared device?**	No	A change was made to correct a coding error by adding a new database. This caused a change to the design specifications of the software.

Outcome: Continue to question 3.

3. Flowchart Question 3 Examples

3.1. Adding a new diagnostic parameter

Description: An electroencephalogram (EEG) diagnostic monitor was cleared with spectral edge frequency (SEF) and peak power (PP) as quantitative parameters. The device's intended use is to monitor brain electrical activity through electrodes placed on the surface of the head. A software modification is made to add Amplitude Integrated EEG (aEEG) as an additional quantitative parameter that was not included in the original premarket notification.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
3	**Does the change introduce a new cause or modify an existing cause of a hazardous situation that could result in significant harm and that is not effectively mitigated in the most recently cleared device?**	Yes	The hazardous situation most commonly associated with quantitative diagnostic parameters is the risk of incorrect or confusing information to the physician leading to a misdiagnosis which could result in significant harm. While the causes of incorrect information for SEF and PP would be included in the original risk files, aEEG introduces a new cause related to an error in the aEEG calculation. A new 510(k) is required because the new cause is not effectively mitigated in the most recently cleared device and the hazardous situation, as discussed above, could result in significant harm.

Outcome: Submit the change in a new 510(k).

3.2. Removing a diagnostic parameter

Description: An EEG diagnostic monitor was cleared with SEF and PP as quantitative parameters. The device's intended use is to monitor brain electrical activity through electrodes placed on the surface of the head. A modification is made to remove PP from the displayed quantitative parameters based on lack of need from marketing.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
3	**Does the change introduce a new cause or modify an existing cause of a hazardous situation that could result in significant harm and that is not effectively mitigated in the most recently cleared device?**	No	Removal of PP does not introduce a new cause of a hazardous situation or change an existing cause of a hazardous situation that is not effectively mitigated.

Outcome: Continue to question 4.

4. Flowchart Question 4 Examples

4.1. Customer maintenance procedure

Description: The manufacturer makes a software modification to prevent a patient sample probe motor from overheating during a customer maintenance procedure. Power is applied to the sample probe motor to keep the sample probe assembly in a locked position during the user maintenance procedure. In the field, it was reported that applying power to the sample probe motor for more than 20 minutes causes the motor to overheat and creates a potential minor burn hazard (i.e., it becomes too hot to touch safely). The software change applies a timeout to power being applied to the sample probe motor during the maintenance procedure; after 10 minutes, power to the sample probe motor is turned off. An additional software change adds a message window at the beginning of the procedure to alert the user that the procedure must be completed within a 10-minute window or the system will cut power to the motor. A limit of 10 minutes was determined to keep the motor from overheating to the point of creating a potential minor burn hazard.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
4	**Does the change introduce a new hazardous situation or modify an existing hazardous situation that could result in significant harm and that is not effectively mitigated in the most recently cleared device?**	No	The change provides mitigation to an existing hazardous situation that was not appropriately mitigated in the cleared device. However, the hazardous situation could not cause significant harm.

Outcome: Continue to question 5.

4.2. Adding new programming mode to a cardiac monitor

Description: The device is an implantable, automatically-activated monitoring system that records subcutaneous electrocardiograms. The manufacturer has made a software modification to add an alternative programming mode that allows the device to interact with the programmer. The mode introduces new technology that impacts the safety profile of the device as a result of the energy transfer that occurs during programming.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
4	**Does the change introduce a new hazardous situation or modify an existing hazardous situation that could result in significant harm and that is not effectively mitigated in the most recently cleared device?**	Yes	This feature introduces new hazardous situations based on the new programming mode that could cause significant harm as a result of energy transfer to the patient.

Outcome: Submit the change in a new 510(k).

4.3. Imaging catheters – new optical module and new laser

Description: The device is an imaging catheter for coronary arteries that includes lasers and optical components. The manufacturer modifies the device software to integrate new optical modules and a new advanced laser method. The integration of the new components and function pose new risks related to interoperability, cybersecurity and performance of the device.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
4	**Does the change introduce a new hazardous situation or modify an existing hazardous situation that could result in significant harm and that is not effectively mitigated in the most recently cleared device?**	Yes	The change introduces new hazardous situations associated with interoperability. This change introduces a new hazardous situation as a result of the optical module not recognizing the new catheter and therefore not providing the correct laser settings, which could result in significant harm.

Outcome: Submit the change in a new 510(k).

5. Flowchart Question 5 Examples

5.1. Modification of a risk control

Description: The device is a robotically-assisted surgical system that utilizes position sensors. The system incorporates primary and secondary sensors to monitor the movement of actuators to prevent uncontrolled motion of the instrument in the event of a component failure. The system goes into a fault state and halts motion if the position information between the sensors does not match within a certain threshold. The threshold for each actuator is programmed in the software and there is a specification for how much overall movement is acceptable at the tip of the instrument before movement stops. The

manufacturer makes a software change to the threshold settings for the position sensors; specifically, the software specification which defines the tip movement was widened. The change was made to minimize false assertion of the safety system, and the change in the specification for movement at the tip of the instrument was still within an appropriate safety tolerance for the device, as determined by analysis done by the manufacturer. However, the change modified an existing risk control (distance that can be travelled under fault conditions) that could significantly affect safety or effectiveness.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
5	**Does the change create or necessitate a new risk control measure or a modification of an existing risk control measure for a hazardous situation that could result in significant harm?**	Yes	The modified threshold values do not meet the specification for overall tip movement, which was required in the most recently cleared device to effectively mitigate the hazardous situation that could result in significant harm. Thus, the change necessitated modification of an existing risk control in the most recently cleared device. Thus, a new 510(k) is required.

Outcome: Submit the change in a new 510(k).

5.2. Modification of threshold settings

Description: The device is a robotically-assisted surgical system that utilizes position sensors. The system incorporates primary and secondary sensors to monitor the movement of actuators to prevent uncontrolled motion of the instrument in the event of a component failure. The system goes into a fault state and halts motion if the position information between the sensors does not match within a certain threshold. The threshold for each actuator is programmed in the software and there is a specification for how much overall movement is acceptable at the tip of the instrument before movement stops. The manufacturer makes a software change to the threshold settings for the position sensors; specifically, the software was modified to better calculate overall movement. The change was made to minimize false assertion of the safety system, which required the surgeon to hit an override button to continue. This requirement can be a nuisance and distract from surgery. The modified software continued to meet the specification for movement at the tip of the instrument after a component failure.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
5	**Does the change create or necessitate a new risk control measure or a modification of an existing risk control measure for a hazardous situation that could result in significant harm?**	No	This change modifies sensor threshold parameters so that transient conditions that can be present during normal operation do not cause unnecessary activation of the risk control measure. The change makes the system more noise-tolerant without impacting true positive detection for the risk control measure. The overall movement criteria are met under all fault conditions.

Outcome: Continue to Question 6.

5.3. Adding user interface alerts and controls

Description: A manufacturer makes software modifications to replace existing modes of controls for handling samples having invalid characters in specimen IDs (specimen identification mis-association) received from Laboratory Information System or middleware vendors. Existing modes of control were adequate, but required operator interaction to evaluate whether a result record for a sample had an invalid Specimen ID. The new modes of control include a design improvement that will not generate results for a sample having an invalid specimen ID. Instead, the system software will: (1) generate a warning message to the operator that an invalid specimen ID was detected; (2) not generate or report results for a sample having an invalid specimen ID; and (3) create a system log entry.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
5	**Does the change create or necessitate a new risk control measure or a modification of an existing risk control measure for a hazardous situation that could result in significant harm?**	Yes	This software change modifies the risk control which identifies invalid characters. If the invalid characters are not identified appropriately, then patient laboratory test results could be lost or replaced by incorrect results either of which could influence treatment decisions, which could cause significant harm.

Outcome: Submit the change in a new 510(k).

5.4. Print patient information on PACS report

Description: A PACS provides the option to print images along with a copy of the diagnostic findings from the radiologist. There is data on each page allowing the user to match each page to the corresponding information (e.g., patient ID, Study Identifier). This data helps to address the known risk of pages being mixed-up after print-out. Based on customer preference, the manufacturer decided to enhance this existing risk control and have actual patient information and demographics printed on each page so it will be easier for the user to identify which pages belong together and, as a result, further decrease the risk of mixing-up printed pages.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
5	**Does the change create or necessitate a new risk control measure or a modification of an existing risk control measure for a hazardous situation that could result in significant harm?**	No	The risk is already sufficiently mitigated with the original risk controls (that is, to have patient identification related information on each printed page). This software modification is a redundant risk control that was not made in response to a new, modified, or previously unknown hazardous situation or cause thereof.

Outcome: Continue to Question 6.

5.5. Infusion pump alarm

Description: A general purpose infusion pump has one alarm to alert the user when an occlusion has been detected. The software change is to provide 4 alarms related to occlusion: air in line, no upstream flow, occlusion downstream and occlusion upstream. These additional alarms provide specific information to help resolve the occlusion.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
5	**Does the change create or necessitate a new risk control measure or a modification of an existing risk control measure for a hazardous situation that could result in significant harm?**	Yes	The change modifies the risk control, i.e., the alarm, which is already present for occlusion. This risk control is necessary to effectively mitigate the hazardous situation that could result in significant harm.

Outcome: Submit the change in a new 510(k).

6. Flowchart Question 6 Examples

6.1. Improve sample throughput 1

Description: A manufacturer makes a software performance enhancement to improve sample throughput time by 20%. Software modifications include changes to decrease assay cycle times by allowing for shorter sample reaction incubation times. Decreasing sample assay times could have an impact on run performance and/or assay performance in a manner that could have a negative impact on diagnosis or therapy delivered to patients.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
6	**Could the change significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device?**	Yes	The change is to increase the throughput performance specification but has a significant impact on the performance of the device, as there is a shorter reaction incubation time and therefore a potential significant impact on diagnostic utility and effectiveness.

Outcome: Submit the change in a new 510(k).

6.2. Improve sample throughput 2

Description: A manufacturer is making a software modification to improve sample throughput by 5% by decreasing pre-analytic processing time. Software modifications include a change to decrease sample delivery time from the sample load area to the

sample aspiration area. The change does not impact the sample analysis algorithm and has no impact on assay performance.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
6	**Could the change significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device?**	No	The modifications do not impact assay performance as it relates to intended use. Improvement resulted from technical analysis of the sample delivery algorithm to optimize timing and remove unnecessary timing delays.

Outcome: If the factors identified in Section VI are not relevant for this change, document the change to file.

6.3. Analyzer remote monitoring feature improvement

Description: A manufacturer makes a software modification to implement new functionality to an analyzer remote monitoring feature. The analyzer remote monitoring feature helps field service during remote troubleshooting of analyzer problems. The new functionality creates a system log of sample test result records that include calibration, quality control, and patient results. This log can be retrieved and reviewed remotely by field service. Software modification includes removing Personal Health Information data when writing from the system software database to the system log of sample test result records.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
6	**Could the change significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device?**	No	The change is not required to support generation of test results and does not impact functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device.

Outcome: If the factors identified in Section VI are not relevant for this change, document the change to file.

6.4. Software change to modify summary window

Description: A manufacturer makes a software modification to increase the number of images that can be viewed in a summary view for an ingestible telemetric gastrointestinal capsule imaging system. The new software allows for four images to be viewed simultaneously instead of two while a user reviews the images. The specifications for the image quality are not impacted by this change.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
6	**Could the change significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of**	No	The change does not significantly impact functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device. Having more images in the window

	the device?		allows for the physician to review more images without increasing software loading time.

Outcome: If the factors identified in Section VI are not relevant for this change, document the change to file.

6.5. OEM module

Description: A multi-parameter monitor device was originally cleared with version A of an original equipment manufacturer (OEM) module for blood oxygen saturation (SpO_2). The OEM makes a change to version A of the SpO_2 sensor. This change does not impact the specifications for the SpO_2 module on the multi-parameter monitor but does necessitate a software change to include the new version number in a lookup table.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
6	**Could the change significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device?**	No	The clinical functionality is not affected. The change to the lookup table allows for this device to be recorded in event logs.

Outcome: If the factors identified in Section VI are not relevant for this change, document the change to file.

6.6. Home monitor

Description: A home monitoring device that includes a Bluetooth module is changed to include the ability to transfer collected or acquired physiologic parameters (such as blood pressure, heart rate, and weight) to a mobile platform for tracking and trending only. The software is written in such a way as to isolate the transfer function from the rest of the device functionality so that it cannot impact the acquisition of the physiologic parameters.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
6	**Could the change significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device?**	No	The functionality added does not significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications and the implementation of the change could not impact any other function of the device.

Outcome: If the factors identified in Section VI are not relevant for this change, document to file.

6.7. Device reprocessor user interface change

Description: A device reprocessor display provides vital information on the temperature, the pressure, and the remaining cycle time. Software changes are made to increase the font size of these parameters on the display. The items are all in their same location and their appearance, aside from the larger size, is unchanged.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
6	**Could the change significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device?**	No	Since the information was previously displayed, the change has no significant effect on the functionality or the performance of the device.

Outcome: If the factors identified in Section VI are not relevant for this change, document the change to file.

6.8. Modify device algorithms

Description: A manufacturer makes a software modification to enhance an arrhythmia detection algorithm. The change impacts sensitivity and specificity, which are critical to the clinical performance of the device.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
6	**Could the change significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device?**	Yes	The modification has direct impact on diagnostic performance of the device. Change directly supports performance specifications that could significantly impact the ability of the device to perform its intended use.

Outcome: Submit the change in a new 510(k).

6.9. Modification to alarm duration

Description: A manufacturer makes a software modification to allow users to silence a low-risk alarm on a dialysis system. The change consists of a "snooze" button that silences the alarm for a set amount of time before resounding.

#	Question	Yes/No	Rationale
6	**Could the change significantly affect clinical functionality or performance specifications that are directly associated with the intended use of the device?**	No	The silencing of a non-critical alarm does not impact the clinical functionality. The criteria for the alarm are unchanged from the most recently cleared device.

Outcome: If the factors identified in section V1 are not relevant for this change, document the change to file.